

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present amendments and following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-9 are pending; Claims 1 and 3 are amended; Claims 6-9 are added; and Claim 2 is canceled herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,619,102 to Salou; Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Salou in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,471,407 to Katano; and Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Salou in view of Katano and further in view of U.S. 2004/0123677 to Omata. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The applied art does not teach or suggest that the sensor of the hub unit is provided at a location between the outer peripheral part of the cylindrical portion of the body-side raceway member and the inside of the flange portion thereof, as claimed in Claim 1. Further, the applied art does not teach or suggest that the sensor of the hub unit is a displacement sensor supported by a support member fixed to one of the cylindrical portions of the body-side raceway member and the flange portion thereof, as claimed in Claim 3.

Instead, Salou discloses as best shown in Figure 1, a bearing 1 which includes an outer raceway 2 and a rotating inner raceway 3 with rolling bodies therebetween. In order to fix bearing 1 to a fixed structure, the fixed raceway 2 includes a flange 14 made in one piece, extending radially to at least part of the circumference of bearing 1. The flange 14 includes four first radial projections 22, 23, 24 and 25 in which holes 18 are provided and forms the first fixing means 5. Additionally, the flange comprises hollow zones 19, 20 and 21 whose radial and/or axial dimensions are less than the radial or respective axial dimensions of the

first projections 22, 23, 24 and 25. In order to measure the deformations of bearing 1, at least one sensor 26 is associated with at least one or all of the elastic deformation zones 19, 20 and 21. The projections 32 and 33 each comprise at least one elastic deformation zone that includes a sensor 26. Accordingly, as shown in Figure 1 of Salou, a sensor 26 is shown at elastic deformation zone 19, and a sensor 26 is shown at the second projection 33.

In contrast, according to the claimed invention, the sensor is provided at a location between the outer peripheral part of the cylindrical portion of the body-side raceway member and the inside of the flange portion thereof, as claimed in Claim 1. This feature is not taught or suggested in Salou. Because Katano is not relied upon to provide the feature identified as deficient in Salou, Katano is not substantially addressed herewith.

The position of the sensor provides information regarding the impact on the amount of deformation (string) obtained from the sensor. That is, according to exemplary embodiments of the present invention, the advantageous effect is that sensitivity of the sensor is improved to a large degree because the sensor is provided in a position where a large amount of deformation can be obtained. Salou does not disclose the features of the claimed invention discussed above, and therefore cannot provide at least the advantages discussed above.

With respect to Claim 3, the applied art does not teach or suggest that the sensor is a displacement sensor supported by a support member fixed to one of the cylindrical portions of the body-side raceway member and the flange portion thereof. Additionally, the Office Action does not particularly assert a disclosure in either Salou, Kitano, or Omata for such a feature.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no basis in the teachings of any of Salou, Kitano, or Omata to support the applied combinations. Certainly, the outstanding Office Action fails to cite any specific teachings within any of these references to provide

motivation for the combination herein. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Salou, Kitano, and Omata is the result of hindsight reconstruction in view of the present specification, and is improper.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Surinder Sachar

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

BDL:KMM\la
I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\253736\AMDT DUE 6JAN06.DOC

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423